DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 776 EA 013 013

AUTHOR Joyce, Bruce R.
TITLE The Social Ecology of the School: The Dynamics of the Internal/External Systems. The South Bay Project.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Elementary Education; Ethnography; Experimental Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Interaction; Interpersonal Relationship; Organizational Effectiveness; Parent School Relationship; Preservice Teacher Education; *Social Influences; *Social Systems; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the summative evaluation of a four-year Teacher Corps project at a California elementary school. The archives of the project and interviews with over 60 of the persons involved are the basis of the report. The investigation focused on an examination of the school's formal and informal systems. The study looks at (1) the social system of the school; (2) the psychological orientations of the teachers; (3) the utilization of training; (4) changes in the behavior of the teachers; and (5) relationships between teacher behavior, learning styles, and achievement. Taken together, these studies provide a picture of the problems of tailoring staff development efforts to the particular configurations of the school and teacher. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED193776

THE SOCIAL ECOLOGY OF THE SCHOOL:

THE DYNAMICS OF THE INTERNAL/EXTERNAL SYSTEMS

The South Bay Project

Bruce R. Joyce
Booksend Laboratories
Palo Alto, California

EA 013 013

Paper presented at 1980 Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Boston, Mass.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Joyce
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Project Setting	3
The Neighborhood	3
Beginnings: The Original Goals and Structure of the Project	4
Research and the Practitioner: The Original Vision of the Project	5
Models of Teaching	5
Learning Styles	6
The Analysis of Teaching	6
The Research Counselor	7
The Community	7
The Structure of the Project	9
Emergent Goals	11
The Project as a Set of Human Systems	14
The Staff of the Project	14
The South Bay School Faculty	16
Educational Orientation	17
Social Organization	17
Relations With the Principal	18
Cliques	20
How Would You Get Things Done Around Here?	20
The Coming of the Project	23
Responsibility and Ownership	24
The Faculty of the Local University	25
The National Program Staff	26
The Parents as a Social System	28

The Interaction 29

The Impact on the School 31

Lessons 38

Propositions for the Future 39

INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the summative evaluation of an Eleventh and Twelfth Cycle Teacher Corps project in California. The setting was the South Bay School, an elementary school serving about 450 children in a school district of twenty-six similar-sized schools. The focus of the report is on lessons learned from the four-year experience. Several previous evaluations and research projects have been carried out in conjunction with the project. (Earlier papers have reported a major study of Teacher Decision Making,[1] the teaching styles in the school,[2] the learning styles of the students,[3] and the effects of certain types of training on the behavior of teachers.[4]) As the time approached for the project to end, its staff decided that these earlier studies, which utilized relatively "hard" data and precise designs, had not captured the essential lessons which are available from the overall experience. The dynamics of the social systems of the school, the district, the project staff, the university, had not been described. The nature of the interactive temporary system generated as they came together had not been analyzed. Yet, the intuitive sense of the project staff was that the important message lay in a set of human events embedded in the social systems of the disparate institutions. Thus the decision was made to use a more fragile but powerful methodology to explore the human systems which made up the project--to attempt, through interviews, to reconstruct the history of its tiny culture and to interpret the picture thus obtained in terms of lessons for future preservice and inservice teacher education efforts.

The interviews were conducted during the Spring of 1979 by Bruce Joyce, Michael McKibbin and Richard Dershimer. Interview guides were constructed based on George Homan's concepts of internal and external systems, following the methodology used by Louis Smith in his ethnographies of an innovative school[5] and an inner city classroom.[6]

The interviews were carried out with: (1) district level administrators who had varying degrees of contact with the project and responsibility for its direction, (2) building level administrators, (3) university professors and administrators who had central roles in or contact with the project, (4) teachers in the elementary school which was the primary project site, (5) project staff, (6) community members who had been closely allied with the project, and (7) community members who had had peripheral involvement. Periodically during the period in which the interviews were conducted, the interviewers worked together to try to standardize their interview techniques and to compare notes.

Interviews were conducted with informants until the interviewers agreed that the information retrieved was becoming increasingly redundant. Altogether more than sixty interviews took place.

The report that follows attempts to tell the story gleaned from those interviews and from the archives of the project. It begins with a description of the setting and proceeds to the stated goals of the project and the process by which goals emerged. It tells the evolving story of the staff and the program which was generated. Special attention is given to the nature of the social system of the school and the staff and the critical incidents (largely unintended ones), which appeared to influence the direction of the project. The report concludes with a description of the apparent effects of the project and a statement of what appear to be the lessons learned from this intensive experience. The lessons are stated as a series of hypotheses which can be tested in future efforts.

THE PROJECT SETTING

The setting is a school and its community. We will refer to the school as the South Bay School and the community as South Bay.

For four years the school was the site of an extensive Teacher Corps project operated cooperatively by a local state university, the school district and, for the first two years, an educational research laboratory.

In accordance with Teacher Corps regulations the project was designed to provide both preservice and inservice training. There were four preservice teacher candidates in each cycle and the inservice program was designed to provide offerings to the twenty teachers making up the South Bay School staff.

The school is staffed by twenty-one teachers, an assistant principal, and two secretaries. It is served by three instructional specialists which are shared with other schools. The South Bay School qualifies for SB 90 EDY funds by virtue of the economic conditions of its neighborhood.

The Neighborhood

Physically, the South Bay community consists of small, pleasant single-family homes which are inhabited by an ethnically diverse array of people. They are: first, second and third generation Americans of Mexican origin; first and second generation Portuguese, first generation Vietnamese, a sprinkling of Asians, and Blacks and a fair number of English speaking Americans whose ancestors came from Northern European countries. Although an intensive analysis of the community was not made it appears that there are several ethnic pockets within which people have regular contact with one another, but that cross-ethnic group interaction is irregular. Given today's world, the community is relatively stable. Ten to twenty percent of the school population moves in the

course of any given twelve months. The houses were built between ten and twenty years ago and the school opened eleven years ago. Most of the families are two-parent homes with two or more children. In the majority of homes at least one parent is employed and in many cases both parents work. Nearly all of the teachers and the administration describe the community as composed of hardworking, upwardly mobile, "lower middle class" people. Community members tend to agree but some believe that the teachers may underestimate the economic status of their community. None of the teachers themselves live in South Bay.

Both teachers and community members agree that the school is a happy place for children. Members of both groups seem to feel that the teachers work hard and do a fairly good job and that most of the parents are supportive of the curriculum and goals of the school. Teachers and community members appear to share an orientation toward the basic skills--providing the students with a firm, basic education on which they can build in high school and beyond. In fact, there appears to be near unanimous agreement about what should be and actually are the goals of the school in this community. Most teachers and community members also agree about how the school is and should be run--they manifested considerable respect for the principal and believe that he is open and friendly on a one-to-one personal basis.

BEGINNINGS: THE ORIGINAL GOALS AND STRUCTURE OF THE PROJECT

In the late Fall of 1974 the South Bay school district, the school, and a nearby state university were approached by members of a research team from a research and development laboratory. They proposed that the district, university and laboratory make a joint application for a Teacher Corps project which would emphasize the application of research to classroom practice. The researchers from the laboratory would provide the channels to the educational

research and personnel from the district, university and school and laboratory would work together to find ways of applying specific areas of research to educational practice. District and university officials agreed and the proposal was created and presented to the teachers at the South Bay School. By a majority vote the teachers agreed to participate provided that activities were offered on a voluntary basis. That is, although the faculty of the school would be involved in determining the shape of the activities, any given teacher could opt not to participate.

Thus the project came to the school from an initiative which lay outside the school district and the university itself. The original organizational impetus for the project lay with the members of the staff that were brought together by the laboratory and the university and the original focus was to make the research available to practitioners.

Research and the Practitioner: The Original Vision of the Project

As originally conceived the design team envisioned bringing research to practitioners through several vehicles. This vision greatly affected the eventual structure of the project.

Models of Teaching. One device was through training in a variety of models of teaching. The models to be offered were relatively well-researched approaches to teaching. Three of the members of the staff were selected because of their competence in helping teachers acquire different teaching strategies. Instructional materials had been prepared (and more were developed in the course of the project) which can help teachers examine the theory of a variety of teaching strategies, see live and videotaped demonstrations of them, practice them with coaching, and receive specific feedback as they experiment with them. The models of teaching component was accompanied by an evaluation component designed to

determine the extent to which teachers opted to explore various models, the levels of skill which they achieved with regard to them, and the extent to which they transformed them into use in the classroom.

Learning Styles. A faculty member at the State University who eventually became the principal investigator of the project at the university level, has developed a system for helping teachers to study the learning styles of their children and to adjust teaching methods to provide optional learning environments for each child. The method used is to train observers/helpers who can enter the classroom, analyze the learning styles of individual children and help the teachers develop prescriptions and observe the effects on the students. Three such observer-helpers had been trained prior to the project and were employed under the direction of the university faculty member. Research was designed to accompany the learning style component also--to track the extent to which teachers used the observers, the behavioral changes which took place in the children and the modifications which took place in the teaching styles of the teachers. This research is being reported in a separate document.

The Analysis of Teaching. The third device used to make research available to the teachers was one designed to assist them in the study of their own teaching using devices developed by researchers. Melvin Semmel of Indiana University developed a computer-based feedback system which operated in the following manner. An observer would enter the classroom using an observation system agreed on beforehand by the teacher and the observer. The observation would be made and then immediately transmitted through a terminal to a computer whose programs would operate on the data and print out summaries of the analysis so that the teacher could examine the patterns of behavior, compare them with previous patterns, set goals for behavioral changes, and track the ability to which they were able to make those changes. A system modelled after Semmel's

work was developed by members of the project staff and put into effect. A multi-dimensional interaction-analysis system was selected, observers were trained, programs were written and the feedback was made available through computers at a nearby university. In addition to permitting the teachers to inquire into their own teaching styles the system had the capability for permitting a longitudinal study of the development of the teaching styles of the teachers and for tracking the effects of training on various dimensions of their behavior. As it turned out, only one of the teachers opted to use the feedback system consistently but it functioned effectively during a large scale longitudinal study of the behavior of the teachers and the impact of the training components was studied using it.

The Research Counselor. Although the other three components were designed to help teachers use research findings and tools very likely to be relevant to most classrooms, a fourth component was designed to make available tailored reports about specific pieces of research relative to specific teaching needs identified by the teachers. The post of research counselor was invented for this purpose. The intent was that the counselor interview each teacher, find out the areas of their concern, and then review relevant areas of research and prepare digests of findings for them. Thus, if the teacher expressed concern about the nature of giftedness in children a researcher might identify studies of the gifted, find diagnostic tools for the study of giftedness, and prepare summaries of research into how intellectual capability affects responses to learning environments. Thus, while the first three components made available to the teachers already developed systems derived from research, the fourth was designed so that it could emerge directly from the teachers' concerns.

The Community

The basic Teacher Corps structure provides for a community coordinator. A

council of parents and other community members will be developed to generate a program to bring the school and community closer together. Although the position was provided for in the proposal, no strategy for community involvement was envisioned at the outset of the project.

The core of the envisioned goals of the project, then, were generated by researchers and trainers who hoped to adapt research in such a way as to benefit classroom practice and who also wanted to conduct research to determine the effects of training options on their clientele.

In addition to the components described above, university courses were available to the teachers as were a variety of workshops which will be described below. All of the resources of the project were not tied up in the components thus described--they were simply the major components within the vision of the project designers.

It was envisioned that the four research-based components, taken together, would present to the teachers a considerable variety of options from which they could choose. They could opt to explore any of a dozen or so models of teaching, study the learning styles of any or all of their children, study a variety of dimensions of their teaching behavior and solicit research findings pertinent to questions they wished to explore.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE PROJECT

Teacher Corps projects are funded through two grants, one to a higher education institution and the other to a local education agency. This practice was followed at the South Bay Project with an additional unusual feature of two sub-contracts, one to the educational laboratory and the second to an individual who was to be responsible for the development of instructional materials and for evaluating several aspects of the project. The contract to the individual was relatively small and funded through the university, but it continued throughout the life of the project. The contract to the laboratory was relatively large but continued for only two years.

The principal investigator at the university was the professor who developed the system for studying the learning styles of children. He recruited several other members of the university. Their services were purchased to provide various kinds of instruction to the South Bay teachers and to the interns as the project proceeded. The university principal investigator was designated as the project director. The project co-director was a member of the laboratory staff who agreed to work full-time on the site as an organizer, trainer, and researcher. Two other members of the laboratory staff were assigned part-time to the project during its first year.

Another full time staff member was hired as an organizer, trainer and researcher. He became the program development specialist. One of the teachers was released to become a team leader working largely with the interns, but was also expected to generate other activities. The documentor-evaluator agreed to work not only as evaluator but as a trainer, especially with respect to the models of teaching component. Two computer programmers were employed. Three observers were employed who became competent in both the "learning-styles" and interaction analysis systems. A community coordinator was employed during the

summer of the first year of the project. In addition the staff was joined mid-way in the first year by a person who was originally expected to fill the "research counselor" position but later became more active in the community-oriented aspects of the project. This individual had been the executive secretary of a large national research organization and a long-time consultant to various government, state, and local agencies.

The steering committee was composed of a representative of the district office, the university principal investigator, the three laboratory staff members, a second trainer-development researchers (the program development specialist), the community coordinator, the documentor-evaluator, the principal, and several teachers and community members.

The object of the project was to improve education in a school in which there were twenty-one teachers, a principal and an assistant principal who was designated as a "site coordinator." In relation to these twenty-three persons there were eleven staff persons working in some capacity or another. Several of these new additions to the school community carried with them extremely well-developed and researched tools and a long history of training experience and research. Several had conducted large-scale investigations of preservice and inservice education and seven of them had published research and theoretical research on education. (Together, the staff of this project had published more than 20 books and over 150 articles.)

Altogether, it was an unusually experienced and well-known staff. As one of the newer staff members said, "I feel like I am a utility infielder on the 1927 New York Yankees." Although an overstatement, this phrase reflected the belief that the staff possessed considerable potential power.

If the reader has the impression that a rather ordinary suburban school had been entered by a group of highly sophisticated prima donnas the impression is

well taken. The little society of the school and its community had been brought together with a collection of well-developed individuals who were attempting to form a cohesive, innovation-oriented group. The interaction within this staff contained different elements than those of the longer-standing, better established school culture, and the "staff-culture" and "school culture" became major entities in the evolution of the project.

THE EMERGENT GOALS

The project began in the fall of 1975 in a relatively straightforward way. Meetings were called in which the project options were explained to the teachers and their involvement was invited to determine how to develop and carry out activities. The project steering committee met and made plans to carry out the development work necessary to bring the major training programs into existence. It immediately became clear that there were a number of problems which had not been anticipated in the project design.

Foremost, probably, was that the teachers at the South Bay School had by no means clearly envisioned the amount of time and energy which would be demanded of them simply to participate in training activities, let alone to work with the project staff to shape the activities so that they would be effective. As we will see below, the school faculty members were relatively comfortable with one another, but did not operate in a collective, problem-solving mode. Group training activities had been rare before the project and the majority of the staff were resistant to the ideas of public teaching, training and feedback. Most had not visited one another's classrooms and the norm was one of avoidance of challenge to one another. In addition it was made clear to the project staff that the teachers expected the project to live up to the "volunteers only" condition for training activities that had been agreed on when the faculty was

first approached to participate in the project. The principal's style of working with the teachers was essentially diadic. That is, he worked with staff members individually, and, while he frequently made suggestions, was extremely supportive of the desires of those individuals, including their needs for privacy in teaching. The project staff found that working with the faculty as a group was very difficult and that the principal supported individuals when they wished to avoid group decision-making. Gradually the project staff became co-opted into the mode of the faculty society and decided to work with the faculty on an individual basis or in small groups to help them clarify their perceptions of their training needs and to determine the match between those expressed needs and the range of options that had been planned for and might be made available. The project, which had envisioned collective action, evolved into one in which the dominant mode was to help individual teachers to reflect on their work and to negotiate the directions they would like to pursue.

Second, although it was not articulated clearly until relatively late in the project, it became a goal to help the faculty and principal work together to set collective ends and make the plans to achieve them. This goal emerged from the growing awareness of the limitations of individual decision-making. Unless a collective mode could be developed, broad school-improvement plans simply could not be generated.

Third, it became quite apparent that the community members had experienced a relatively low level of involvement in the school in the past, that many were intimidated by school personnel, and that many felt a need for assistance in reaching out to their fellow community members. Thus the efforts to work with community members became more directed as the project matured. Parents expressed the need for help in tutoring their students and the staff offered training to them. Many exercised the option to participate in that training. Parents also

experienced the need to communicate better with their families as well as the school. Training in family communication was offered and participated in by a number of families.

Fourth, it became apparent that the administration of the school-district and university held a relatively laissez-faire attitude toward the project and that, if the efforts of the project were to become institutionalized, a major effort would have to be made by the project staff. Activities were increasingly directed toward the involvement of university faculty, other schools, and school district personnel.

Thus, the entire social climate of the school and its community rose over time to compete with the original training objectives. Project staff became increasingly co-opted by the leadership style of the school and the social system of the faculty. Ways of organizing and involving community members became more permanent. Energy turned toward involving the university and district in such a way that the efforts of the project would not be lost when it ended.

THE PROJECT AS A SET OF HUMAN SYSTEMS

Not infrequently the success and failure of particular elements of projects are thought of in terms of the competency, personality, and attitudes of individuals. Someone is a "forceful administrator," someone else is "resistant to change," another individual is "compliant," still another is "defensive." Recently educational theoreticians have begun to place more emphasis on the role of human groups, especially on the influence that common and shared perceptions, expectations, and norms have on the behavior of individual members.[5] While the life of the South Bay Project was, in fact, the life of many individuals whose personalities and independent constellations of competence were extremely important, there were five human systems that came into play during the four years. These systems are composed of:

(1) the staff assembled to operate the project
(2) the faculty of the South Bay School and the central office staff of the district
(3) the faculty of the school of education at the local university
(4) a subset of the parents whose children attend the South Bay School, and
(5) the staff at the national level of the Teacher Corps

These five human systems impinged on each other in a variety of formal and informal ways, some quite apparent and others subtle and difficult to discern. Each of these social systems had relatively distinctive characteristics and the behavior of the people within each group were heavily influenced by their group membership. When interacting with one another, members of each social system manifested the norms of that group with the result that transactions frequently took on the character of cultural interchange.

THE STAFF OF THE PROJECT

As indicated earlier, the assembled staff was composed of recognized profes-

sionals, each accustomed to and expecting to operate with a fairly high degree of autonomy. Specific administrative roles, while they were identified by title, were never fully delineated. The energies and initiatives of the principal investigator, designated as the official director, were largely concentrated in one component--he had to (and frequently did) make an effort to consider the project as a whole. The co-director, a member of the laboratory, was heavily invested in a number of the research studies which were carried out but had a broader general interest in program direction than did the principal investigator. The program development specialist was broadly interested in the project and exercised a great deal of the field leadership but felt constrained by having a lesser official position than the co-directors. One of the consultants (the "documentation-evaluator") exercised more influence than outsiders usually do, by serving as trainer, evaluator, member of the advisory board, and through interest in several of the investigations which took place in the course of the project. The norms of the project staff were built around a recognition that each one wished to operate independently, but that their project-related activities had to be related in some way to the focus of the project. There was a continual tension between self-interest (usually concentrated in one aspect of the project) and overall project management. Two of the original proposal writers, members of the laboratory staff, dropped out of the project after the first year when it appeared that they would not be able to exercise the extent of influence that they are accustomed to wielding in most of their professional relationships.

In addition, the structure of the project staff was influenced by previous and emergent personal and professional relationships. The research counselor had worked with the documentor-evaluator for more than twenty years, and became married to the project co-director. The program development specialist and a documentor had worked together for nearly ten years prior to the beginning of

the project. The university director had worked with his co-director for nearly fifteen years. Through longevity and various types of experience these individuals had developed strong personal and professional ties so that informal channels of communication within the project staff varied enormously.

The social system of the project staff materialized to facilitate multiple individual efforts rather than taking on a focused, systematic approach to change in the school. The chief staff members found themselves in competition for resources and personnel, a competition that resulted in bitter controversy during the first few months of the project. To make such a staff functional would have probably required consummate management skills from the director firmly ensconced in a system with a considerable power base. However, the principals represented three separate institutions and several had strong independent credentials. Thus, it is doubtful that any director could have arranged the authority that would have made management an easy task and it turned out that the university principal investigator, the officially-designated leader, was not inclined to that sort of management which compounded the fact that he worked from a narrow power base.

Especially during the first two years of the project there was considerable turbulence within the staff but a state of dynamic equilibrium gradually emerged that enabled it to function very satisfactorily in the sense that the project was carried on and was very productive in certain ways, not all of them envisioned as the project was being planned. Despite the self interests, the commitment to knowledge production and innovation in schooling dominated the norms of the group while protecting the research interests of the individuals.

THE SOUTH BAY SCHOOL FACULTY

Compared to the project staff the school faculty was a much more stable and balanced system. The principal and several of the teachers had been together

since the school opened twelve years before. There had been no change at all in faculty memberships for three years prior to the arrival of the project. The school had never known serious controversy either within the staff or in its relationship with the community.

Educational Orientation. Nearly everyone seems to agree that South Bay is a "basic skills" school. That is, it is educationally conservative. The teachers believe they are relatively competent as a group and most of the community members believe thay are competent as well. Generally, the teachers are more critical about one another than the community members are about them. Frequently they say "the school is a happy place for children." Nearly everyone on the faculty believes that most of the children are happy and cooperative and fit in very well with the education that is offered to them. The teachers feel that most of the community members and parents are relatively accessible and that, especially since Teacher Corps came on the scene, more parents are reaching out toward the school. Most of the teachers appear to be pleased about this.

Social Organization. Nearly all the teachers believe that the principal is very supportive of their individual activities in the classroom. They feel free to try out innovations and, as long as the classroom is run on a relatively even keel, they will receive no complaints. Each one reported that they could go to the principal individually. Collectively, however, they complain that they often have trouble "being heard."

The school is not organized for collective change. There is a clearly identifiable group of teachers who will resist any proposals for general change and most of the others do not feel like tangling with the resistors when they raise objections about proposed innovations. It is relatively easy for the principal or a project staff member to work with an individual teacher or group of

teachers to bring about an improvement in a specific classroom, but there is no general school improvement plan or even any semblance of a curriculum. The relatively skimpy curriculum guides from the district define some of the substance of reading and mathematics, but the textbook is the chief source of content. For all practical purposes there are no social studies, literature or science curricula in the school, although individual teachers organize activities in those areas.

Relations With the Principal. Nearly everyone enjoys interacting with the principal and most of the professional interaction is done on a one-to-one basis. While the principal is relatively powerful in the sociometric sense, that is, most decision making would be channeled through him at one point or another as any issue evolved, the lack of a problem-solving organization prevents him from having much positive power. As one of the teachers put it, "The principal works with the budget, arranges meetings and deals with red tape. I look at him as a business man not as an educator."

Another teacher said, "The principal tries to get input from the teachers although some don't feel he listens. For a long time the district set most of the policies but now schools have more choice. We don't do much to exercise our power." A third said, "He tries to be available to parents and works hard with the PTA and the school community council. He's always been open and radiates a sense of encouraging, constructive criticism. He listens to teachers and parents about equally and tries to keep teachers happy, but keeps his ear to the ground in the community as well."

The operating style of the system was characterized by a clear demarcation between the functions of the teachers and the principal. The teachers were proud of their autonomy and the principal respected it. Matters that teachers could not handle within the classroom were referred to the principal and usually

settled between that teacher and the principal. While there were committees of teachers that considered specific areas and from time to time matters that required collective action by the faculty were referred from the district office, the social organization is marked by sets of diadic relationships. Teachers rarely gather together in groups to share professional experience or to seek assistance. Most questions are settled by informal discussion between the principal and the staff members.

The decision to participate in the Teacher Corps Project is a good example of the operation of the faculty-principal system. The principal introduced the issue and negotiated with the teachers by reassuring them that only those who volunteered for activities would have to participate in them. An opposition group held a sub-rosa meeting but failed to enlist a majority of their colleagues to vote against the issue of having the project. Failing to gain a majority, they simply decided to exercise their right of non-participation. It would never have occurred to the principal or any of the other teachers to sanction those members who attempted to operate outside the formal decision-making meeting. The formal system is more loose and less powerful than the informal one.

Repeatedly, when asked how to "make a change" at the school, faculty members reported that making a change involving more than two people is virtually impossible. The faculty and the principal respect the right of any individual not to participate or to go along with any decision. Thus there can be no binding decisions without a consensus and there is no mechanism for reaching consensus. All members of the staff are reluctant to vote for any proposition that would require their fellows to acquiesce. Consequently, positive propositions are virtually assured of not succeeding. No member of the staff, nor the principal, nor any outsider can effectively receive affirmation with respect to any change that might affect all of the members of that social system.

Cliques

There are a number of divisive elements in the social organization. The teachers "clique up" in a variety of ways. The most prominent division is between primary and upper grade teachers. They tend to eat together and socialize informally. There are also the teachers who come late and leave early and those who come early and leave late. When an innovation has been offered by Teacher Corps there are those who are receptive and those who resist and temporary cliques develop over the issue. Those who supported the Teacher Corps project tended to find some affinity again vis-a-vis those who did not. Personal affinities regulate professional relationships. As one of the teachers put it, "A lot of gossip goes on. Most people simply see teaching as just a job, one that has a high priority but not the priority. They band together then not so much on real professional issues as on a comfort basis. The people who stay late are more comfortable with the others who stay late than they are with the others who leave early, and so on." The same teacher said later on, "This place would be very difficult to change unless a real crisis occurred. I can hardly think of anything serious enough unless the school actually burned down. Most of the teachers kind of seek a norm. They don't talk much about their teaching and people in the same grade try to stay fairly close together, that is not pushing the kids too fast or too slow." Another said that, "The norm here is that if you share your accomplishments you are bragging. You are not expected to do anything outstanding and if you even think you're doing something interesting and try to share it you will be put down."

HOW WOULD YOU GET THINGS DONE AROUND HERE?

Nearly all of the teachers said that if a concern arose that involved the entire school they would begin by going to the principal and that if he was not

interested they probably would back off from the issue. However, even if he was interested, he reported that he would need the support of the faculty for most kinds of changes. He could institute minor improvements but anything involving very many people would probably be scuttled by lack of interest.

One of the teachers stated her belief that the school is about fifteen years behind present day educational practices because it is isolated and protected. According to her, the principal has protected the teachers and they have isolated themselves from the contemporary educational world. "Relatively few of them are even on district committees--they have their own little world and want to be there." The same teacher stated that instructional materials are regarded by each teacher as their "own" property and that they do not willingly share the materials although it is obviously not their personal property. She feels that the teachers are afraid and protective but she doesn't know just why. The same teacher had worked in two other schools within the district and said that they used district consultants frequently and that the district had excellent consultants but that for some reason or other they never visit the South Bay school. A teacher who deviates from these norms will be isolated by the others. She mentioned one teacher who is relatively flamboyant in style and is talked about by the other teachers in a negative fashion and is sanctioned by being avoided in the lunchroom and other places where people gather.

Most of the teachers have never visited another classroom in the course of their career except in the case of cooperative teaching with respect to shared art and physical education activities.

"Changing the school is a different kettle of fish. There is no built-in change process and I really don't have any idea how I'd go about making a major change if I wanted to."

The curriculum is by and large determined by the textbook. The recitation style of teaching is dominant. As one teacher said, "I look at the State text and use it to help me decide on the content. I use other materials and try to vary my approaches each day, but I work within a basic structure. Generally speaking, we third grade teachers discuss what we're doing and try to stay within a range. No one wants to get too far ahead or fall too far behind. We don't discuss teaching, as such, though, we do discuss the children."

The following is a quote from the report of one of the long-term studies of teaching which took place during the life of the project.

"Making a big change would be really tough here. There'd be a wall of resistance to almost anything that affected more than a single teacher. The only strategy that would work here would be to take one or two people at a time."

THE COMING OF THE PROJECT

The faculty was divided in their approval of the project from the beginning. The school had had the option to participate in a voucher plan within the district and the faculty had voted not to engage in the "Vouchers." They developed a very negative attitude for what they regarded as federal interference in their way of working. This was unknown to the Teacher Corps project staff as the project was initiated. One of the teachers stated directly that "When we voted for Teacher Corps we were led to believe that we could vote for it but then not participate in it. It's as if the people who approached us wanted to make sure that there would be a project here but did not much care whether anything happened. Then the staff showed up and it turned out that there were a lot of purposes that had been developed that we hadn't known about. Everybody began with a lot of energy and pretending that people were involved. Attendance at meetings and so forth was interpreted as involvement. The people who were against the project had a big meeting but couldn't muster enough energy to oppose it definitively and it turned out that they liked the staff so they backed off gradually. Some of the people who were most opposed are very involved now. The most important mistake was that the whole issue of what the project should become and how much the faculty should own it was never discussed in a serious way."

The individual faculty relationships with the principal enable faculty members to avoid activities if they choose to. As one of the teachers put it, "In a very quiet way anybody who didn't want anything could simply go to the principal and give him some excuse and he would assure them that it was okay if they didn't participate."

The teachers are in charge of their own classrooms. As one put it, "I am the captain of my own little ship. If I want to make a change I go

to the principal and ask him about it. He trusts that I and most of the others can experiment but not let things get out of hand. I will keep him informed if I'm going to do anything very different."

Because the project staff were also operating within a social system that placed a greater emphasis on individual interest than on collective action, the staff never confronted the faculty social system with respect to major school-wide change of any sort. Had the project been re-shaped to attempt total school change it is quite likely that the two systems would have assumed an adversarial relationship. However, as it was the project staff never presented a united front to the faculty but agreed to work with the faculty norms of volunteerism. It was not possible to engineer a school improvement plan dealing with any aspect of the school, even a minor one, and the issue about why this was so was never joined.

Responsibility and Ownership. Throughout the life of the project the staff served primarily as deliverers of services to the teachers. Although the teachers were repeatedly involved in planning activities, responsibility was never transferred to the faculty and principal. They never accepted the responsibility for improving themselves but waited for the staff to offer services, looked them over, and individuals chose what they would like to relate to. An illustration of the lack of ownership was the Lawrence Hall of Science "incident."

A number of teachers indicated that they were interested in being exposed to the techniques of science teaching promulgated by the Lawrence Hall of Science in Berkeley. The Hall was contacted and arrangements were made for faculty members to visit it and attend workshops and for consultants to come to the

school and demonstrate materials and activities.

The activities were generally well received except that the primary teachers complained that the materials were better adapted for older children than the ones with whom they worked.

However, most of the teachers did not transfer either the techniques or the materials into their classrooms. The project staff became very frustrated for the teachers had selected the Lawrence Hall of Science out of a wide variety of options, an extensive series of activities had been planned ranging from theory to practice, and yet little use was made of the project.

THE FACULTY OF THE LOCAL UNIVERSITY

The faculty of the school of education impinged on the project in two ways. First, it influenced the project director. Second it was to be a social system on which the project was to have impact and drew energy toward that end. The director essentially accepted the offer of the position because the project offered him an opportunity to test and expand his substantive interests and he was encouraged to pursue those interests by the dean, who had newly come to the university and was anxious to support the few members of the staff who had recognized research interests and scholarly reputations. Thus the enhancement of the individual researcher was the dean's primary interest in the project. The director was not in a politically strong position within the faculty's social system and had relatively little interest in influencing the faculty. However, he was open to the development of ways by which the project might influence the education faculty and a number of programmatic efforts were made in that direction. Generally speaking, the education faculty were relatively

well satisfied with their position as a teacher education institution. On the whole, they do not appear to feel a need to change their programs or improve their individual competencies. They take a "show-me" attitude toward most of the innovations that are offered to them. Most also appear to be relatively suspicious of researchers and a number of them expressed the opinion that their position as teacher educators was very strong and that outside influences were probably not needed to improve their programs or competence. The administration of the school of education did not reach out to the project staff although it cooperated when suggestions were made for activities, such as seminars, courses for the faculty, and demonstrations. The administration made no effort to recruit the project staff as permanent members of the faculty and those who were paid through the university budget were channelled into temporary positions (with the exception of the director). Toward the end of the project a series of seminars were proposed by the project staff for the faculty of the school of education and surrounding schools. One of the suggested seminar leaders was the project director. While expressing respect for him the university administration also suggested that it would not be a good idea to include him because his research interests had so isolated him from the rest of the faculty. The project staff refused to conform to this request and the administration agreed, but only after an acrimonious debate.

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM STAFF

As the project developed its relationship with the National Teacher Corps Staff became adversarial in the extreme. The project monitor complained about the project in a number of ways and frequently insisted that it was not in compliance with federal regulations. The monitor wished more participation from the faculty at the university and objected to the proportion of "temporary

staff members" in the project staff. The monitor asked for more direction from the director and more involvement from the central school office administrators of the school district. The monitor also refused to have the co-director of the project paid through the sub-contract with the educational laboratory, with the result that the co-director left the project after two years. As the co-director left the project the program development specialist appeared to be the logical candidate for leadership but the project monitor refused to accept him and insisted that the director be a permanent member of the university faculty. The issue was never resolved. The operational leader of the project was the program development specialist, the principal investigator presided over fiscal matters, and the project staff generated activities partly independently and partly as a group.

Between the 11th and 12th Cycle a number of events occurred that became very important to project operation. The co-director of the project (actually the operating director) left. The Teacher Corps Washington Staff would not agree with staff decisions about leadership and the leadership issues were left relatively unsolved. In addition, at the onset of Cycle 12 the principal insisted that all teachers become involved "in some way" with the project. He reasoned that since teachers could generate many activities and were allowed to pick and choose from among a wide variety of topics, and because the project staff had been willing to adapt and individualize training to a considerable extent, that there really should be something for everyone. Nonetheless, many of the teachers were reluctant to volunteer and felt "betrayed" by the principal for taking this new stance. He had, in effect, violated the norms of the faculty social system.

As a result of pressure from the Washington staff more "regular" faculty members from the school of education were incorporated into the project staff

on paper. Only one of them actually performed any functions and the project continued to remain on the fringes of university affairs and was viewed by the dean and the faculty as the purview of the principal investigator.

THE PARENTS AS A SOCIAL SYSTEM

The parents of the South Bay School, as indicated earlier, are not ethnically or socially unified and prior to the coming of the project had relatively little involvement in school affairs. However, project activities increasingly involved the parents and gradually a recognizable network of people came into existence composed of persons active in project sponsored activities.

The leaders were the A's and the B's, who had been close friends for years. Mrs. A, who was employed as community coordinator during the third year of the project, used the resources and funds of that office well. She also served as an officer of the PTA. Her husband was elected chairman of the SAC. Mr. B served on SAC and was chairman of the local community action group.

The second parent group consisted essentially of Mexican-Americans, strangers for the most part, until they participated in some of the Teacher Corps activities (like the parent study groups and the tutor training). They linked into the project through Mrs. Jones and through two women who were trained to become school liaison agents.

Surrounding these core groups are many persons who are not as easily identifiable, but who became more active in school affairs, many for the first time. This produced difficulties as well as benefits.

During the final year, the two core groups came into conflict. Funds for the training of the liaison agents expired; some of the Mexican-Americans felt that the project and the school had let them down. Some acrimony resulted which

pushed the two core groups apart. The parent trainer and advisor on community matters attempted to deal with the situation in two ways: by altering the school social system so that the teachers, but particularly the principal could offer more leadership to the parents; and by bringing in from the university some professionals who could advise the parents in ways that they had done previously. Neither attempt proved successful. At the conclusion of the project it appeared that the parent groups were pulling back from interaction with the other systems.

The community members report that prior to the coming of the Teacher Corps project many of the parents felt relatively uncomfortable coming to the school for several reasons. One was a feeling of embarrassment about their ability to use the English language. Second was a feeling that the teachers felt somewhat superior to them. The third reason was that the office of the school is difficult to approach because of the manner in which the clerical staff attempt to solve problems briefly and directly without providing access to the principal or the teachers.

THE INTERACTION

By the end of the third year of the project the social systems were clearly out of synchronization and the promise of the early years of the project did not materialize. During the last year of the project the systems tended to back off from one another and expend energies in maintaining social and intellectual distance. No one system had the mechanisms to face up to this distancing as an issue let alone to try to devise strategies to correct the situation.

The chief project staff never effectively grappled with the central issues (which were ones of major school change). The failure to grapple with the issues has produced some guilt and frustration which, typically, has led to blaming.

The project staff tends to believe that the teachers for the most part are disinterested in professional matters and unwilling or unable to take advantage of what the project has to offer. They also tend to view the faculty at the university as too wrapped up in their own day-to-day matters and possibly too bereft of intellectual curiosity to take advantage of the potential of the project. The faculty of the school tend to believe that the staff of the project is "stand-offish" and perhaps even arrogant at times. None of the local systems has anything good to say about the Washington staff who they believe attacked the project precisely at the time when they should have been providing assistance and support.

Human systems have homeostatic tendencies. It is very difficult to change one. It is particularly difficult for a temporary system, which is what the project staff has been, to alter permanent ones especially if that system is as stable and well balanced as has been the faculty system. Even at the end of this project many of the project staff refused to accept systems change as one of the major goals of the project. These people maintained that the project intended only to alter the teaching behavior of individual persons. This position appears to us to be naive. It ignores the growing evidence of the impact that social systems have on individual behavior. To change the operating system of the school and community required a fairly substantial and sustained intervention. Without that intervention, the potential of a project such as this is likely to be minimal and the institionalization of even the minor changes which it makes is likely to be ephemeral.

THE IMPACT ON THE SCHOOL

What Impact Has the Project Had?

Nearly everyone who is interviewed agreed that the project has not had a great deal of impact on teaching and curriculum. Some of the teachers do use new teaching strategies (see McKibbin's extensive report on this question)[7] although many did not use them extensively. About seventy percent of the teachers, even some who report that they have been impacted considerably themselves, do not feel that the project affected the school in general.

In part the teacher report about the impact may be a product of their social system. Since they work so much as individuals and tend to hide the dynamics of their own teaching from one another, individuals are really not in a very good position to assess the school impact. (Occasionally teachers reported in the interviews that other teachers near them were not being impacted at all where in fact the project staff and those other teachers themselves felt that they had been impacted considerably.) In a social system which is built around a diadic communication network it is extremely difficult for any individual to assess the total social system let alone the impact of particular activities on the behavior of other people. However, it is quite clear that the faculty social system has not changed greatly during the life of the project. As one teacher said, "To change the school we would have had to come at things entirely differently and probably would have used a more powerful experimental approach. Most of the teachers actually regard the Teacher Corps project as a preservice program for interns rather than as a program for themselves." Probably this statement reflects the evolution of the project into a service system for individual teachers as against a general program of school improvement and staff development.

Late in the spring of 1979 the program development specialist interviewed each teacher and asked them what use they had made from things learned from each of the activities. A summary of the results of these interviews appears below:

CURRICULUM AND TEACHING STRATEGIES

	Saw a Demonstration	Participated in Training	Tried Out Activities 1-3 Times	Occasionally Use 4-8 Times	Use on a Semi-regular Basis 9-15 Times	Use Often More Than 15 Times
MODELS OF TEACHING						
Concept Attainment	20	18	7	7	1	3
Synectics	20	17	8	2	1	4
Role Playing	16	9	5	0		3
Inquiry Training	13	8	5	2	1	1
Concept Formation	9	7	1	3		2
Simulation	5	4	1	7		0
Assertive Training	3	1	0	0		1
Relaxation/Desensitization	15	13	2	2		0
Memorization	1	1	0	0		0
Glasser	3	2		1		1
MATHEMATICS						
CMP Math	6	7	3	1	0	3
Math Manipulatives					1	2
Cuisenaire Rods	6	6	0	2		2
Workjobs	6	6	1	3		2
Number Systems	3	3	1			
Math - A Way of Thinking	8	4				
Comparative Lessons	1	1				
SCIENCE						
Lawrence Hall HAP	10	10	5	4	2	
OBIS	10	10	4	4		
					1	1
						1
READING						
Ethna Reid	5	2				
Teaching Reading as Decoding	5	4				
Comparative Lessons	1	1				
VALUES CLARIFICATION (Dick Hersh)	12	9				
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TRAINING	2	2		1		

It will be recalled that some of the major training components of the project were developed external to the school and brought into the school setting, while others were developed as a result of discussions with the teachers about their needs and desires.

The Study of Teaching Component

This component was never really implemented. A system for providing the study of teaching was developed and observers trained to implement it. The operation of the component was explained to the teachers in a series of meetings. Only one teacher in the course of the life of the project opted to participate in that component.

The Research Counselor Component

For a variety of reasons this component was never effectively implemented either, although a person was hired for the position the project staff members who had the major interest in that component left the project after the first year, however, and the teachers and other project staff appeared uncertain about what to do with it, so the "research counselor" was put to work using his skills in counselling primarily to work with community members but also to develop better communication links between teachers and parents.

The Models of Teaching Component

Periodically throughout the life of the project workshops were held on a variety of models of teaching. Seventeen of the twenty teachers reported that they used some of the new teaching strategies on a regular or semi-regular basis. A formal investigation indicated that they can acquire the skills of one model. Fifteen of the seventeen teachers studied appeared able to implement that model at will. Thus the models of teaching component did appear to be effective

at least to some extent and the training impact included transfer into the classroom situation.

The Learning Styles Component

Observers visited and worked in the classrooms of nearly all the teachers during the life of the project. Observers were in some classrooms for the entire four years. The teachers reported that the component was especially beneficial in helping them deal with behavioral problems and many of them believe that they learned to work more effectively in assessing the learning styles of their students and modifying their teaching behavior accordingly.

Teacher-Generated Workshops

The teachers initiated workshops in a number of areas and two of the sequences of activities were extensive. One of these was the Lawrence Hall of Science program mentioned above and the other was the study of stages of moral development and how to deal with them in the classroom.

In neither of these cases did any of the teachers report that they made any use of the products of the workshops. They had initiated the training, it was carried out and well received at the time, but the products simply were not used.

University Courses

Although the course offerings of a very large state university were available throughout the life of the project, the twenty teachers signed up for only forty courses in the four years. This was consistent with their behavior prior to the project. Most of them have many years of teaching experience and have long since completed all their certification requirements and taken the university courses which are normal for elementary school teachers

of their status. It is worth noting in passing that relatively few of the teachers participated in district workshops in the same period. It is highly possible that the project sponged up most of the energy which they would normally have available for inservice work.

The Community Component

The community component became increasingly active through time. The community coordinators worked very hard to involve more parents in school activities and many of the parents who were interviewed reported that they regarded the Teacher Corps project as a very friendly addition to the school. Many of them had felt extremely uncomfortable prior to the coming of the project and the first two years community liaison personnel many more Spanish and Portugese-speaking people to a variety of activities and the counselor initiated sets of meetings with parents and teachers working primarily on communication skills both between community and school and within families. His services were in considerable demand to work with family problems. In addition the project staff organized a number of activities which would involve community members extensively. One especially successful activity was a "non-competitive games" day in which community members, teachers and project staff cooperated. The project staff, then the community coordinators and liaisons devoted considerable energy to this kind of activity.

PTA membership and attendance, while not a direct object of the community component, increased markedly over the life of the project. PTA meetings which previously had been attended by only twenty or thirty parents were attended by a hundred or more on a number of occasions, probably manifesting the relative success of the project in drawing parents more toward the school.

The use of volunteer aides increased somewhat also, and some training for aides was also provided by project staff. In addition, the co-director of the

project and one of the teachers offered training in tutoring--a series of evening workshops attended by fifteen or twenty families consistently while the offerings continued. Nearly everyone agreed that probably the chief impact of the Teacher Corps project was in the area of community relations. Community members came to see the school as a more friendly place and had within it a place to go where they felt welcome. Many Spanish and Portuguese community members who had not been previously interactive with one another extensively began to have a higher level of interaction. They reported especially that they had been shy about their own language handicaps prior to the project but that that shyness disappeared to a considerable extent when they found that they were welcome and able to participate in more meaningful activities. Many community members expressed anxiety that the community component would diminish as the project left the school and project staff members hypothesized that that opinion was probably correct. One manifestation that this concern may be well founded; was that the teachers voted not to continue the activity day when it came time to put it on the schedule for the year, following the project end. In the absence of the Teacher Corps staff the teachers were evidently concerned that they would have to put more energy into the activity days and were not willing to make that investment.

On the other hand, the community members report that they are much more involved in the school than they were when the project started and that increased involvement has been beneficial. Many community members indicated that they had great difficulty approaching the "office" at the school but found the Teacher Corps Project members relatively easy to approach and that the activities generated for teachers and parents together brought many community members much closer to the school than had previously been the case. On the

other hand, a good many of the teachers have strongly resisted any kind of systematic institutionalization of community involvement and several stated directly that they do not want an institutionalized school-community relationship system. Most of the parents expressed considerable anxiety that the school will return to its previous low level of community-school interchange after Teacher Corps leaves. Nonetheless, the involvement of community members has impacted the school in a variety of subtle ways and many more community members have loaned energy to the school during the Project's existence than at any other time since it was opened.

In the latter stages of the project energy was increasingly directed toward helping the faculty and the principal develop a problem-solving mode. Nearly everyone concerned believes that this attempt was abortive and that it will have no long-standing impact. Nonetheless, most teachers who were interviewed indicated that there should be a more effective problem-solving system. The exceptions were three persons, who, interestingly enough, exert a great deal of negative influence on problem-solving activities. It is not surprising that those persons should be satisfied with the present arrangement because in many senses they have achieved identity and security within the social system although their influence is less manifest with respect to getting things done than in stopping proposals made by others.

LESSONS

All-in-all, the project presents a number of puzzles from which we can draw lessons as we plan projects in the future. It was extremely productive as a research application project. Two of the four original components lasted the life of the project and had considerable impact on many of the teachers. Several studies were carried out and have been reported including at least three which potentially will have an impact on the literature in their area.

However, it is more than likely that the university and the school district, as entities, have been relatively untouched. Many individual community members have been influenced substantially and feel that the project has been of great benefit to them. A number of teachers have learned new skills and as an accompanying report indicates that several have been influenced considerably by the project activities. The project staff itself has developed considerably during the period of the project and have developed many skills which they will no doubt carry with them into their future work.

The project had great potential and in many ways was successful. The same university, project staff, and school cooperated for an extended period of time. The teachers participated in considerable amounts of training. Many community members received training and were involved in a variety of ways more closely with the school than they had been before. The problem is that the interaction of the social system prevented the development of a long-term problem-solving mode directed at the improvement of the school and the institutionalization of processes which would keep it in a state of continued renewal. How do we explain this and what lessons do we draw for the future? Since the dynamics of the interaction of the social systems appears to be so important we cast a series of theses about ways of combining social systems more productively than was done in this case.

PROPOSITIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Proposition #1. Temporary and Permanent Systems.

School improvement/staff development projects such as Teacher Corps involve the interaction of a series of relatively long-term social systems. (In this case these were the systems of the school, the school district, the community, and the university.) The project staff make up a relatively temporary

system which as a social system will probably be less powerful than the systems which are there before projects begin and will be there when they end. Even when the project social system is a relatively powerful one and its membership is composed of relatively strong individuals as an entity it will be weaker than the systems that it seeks to impact. It is our belief that this will be the case whether or not the project staff is largely recruited from outside those institutions or developed from within them.

Proposition #2. The fact that a project is a set of human systems in interaction needs to be brought to consciousness relatively early in the history of the project. In other words human systems and their interaction need to become part of the study of all of the individuals involved. Unless individuals understand the extent to which their behavior is controlled by membership within a social system they will not be free to act and will be controlled by forces which are mystifying and powerful and they will develop conflicts which are products of their membership within a given human system rather than matters of their free volition. This condition occurred many times in the South Bay Project. Project staff, school faculty, community members and others behaved in ways which were products of their human systems membership almost as if they themselves lacked free will in the situation.

Proposition #3. Collaboration must penetrate beyond administrative mechanisms. Since the long-term impact of a project depends on changes in the relatively enduring human systems the project membership needs to begin to take steps which recognize that the development of a project is not simply the generation of activities based on an administrative level of agreement among the entities which are collaborating but will require changes in the social systems themselves. Human systems have considerable homeostatic dimensions,

that is, they tend to perpetuate themselves. The kinds of activities which are characteristic of that system are embedded in each system. In the case of the South Bay project the school operated essentially as twenty faculties, each faculty with a single member, loosely united through diadic communication with the principal and small group communication. The system contained factions which generally did not communicate with one another as entities. To generate school improvement plans would require a change in that social system, the study of human behavior within the project and a growing understanding of the extent to which the patterns within the existing system facilitate and inhibit various kinds of behavior will be essential to any kind of change.

Proposition #4. The above three propositions imply a commitment to a considerable investment by individuals and groups in process analysis and in learning new patterns of behavior within one's system and as a member of a system which is interacting with others.

To make such a commitment involves a curious problem because it is relatively easy for individuals to agree to commit to participation in activities in governance structures, whereas it is very unusual for persons to agree in advance that the commitment to governance will also involve a commitment to change in the human systems which provide their lives with meaning. To change the nature of one's human system and relationship to others is never trivial. It is not something that anyone can do without cost, because changing complex behavior patterns always involves an expenditure of energy and the tolerance of discomfort.

Proposition #5. Normally individuals are controlled in many ways by human systems in ways which are generally not recognized. In addition, most people develop a considerable amount of meaning from the support which they receive by

conforming to the human system of which they are a part. Few people occupy positions as innovators within a system. Yet, to achieve power and control over one's own behavior it is absolutely necessary that one participate actively in the processes by which social realities are negotiated and meaning obtained through collaborative behavior. In the case of the South Bay study greater success would have required that the five human systems become aware of themselves as entities and conscious of the degree to which group membership controls their behavior. The individuals involved would have had to express a willingness to develop an integrated social system which bridged the systems and developed a commitment toward the improvement of education and the development of methods of problem solving which were not present in any of the groups as the project commenced. For each system the problems of entry to collaboration were different. The university was not equipped to enter the project in a giving, negotiable way. It was willing to collaborate administratively and at policy levels of governance but not to show the need for change which the project required. The community was relatively powerless and sub-communities were separated from the schools as the project began and an involved community and therefore a changed one was essential for project success. The idiosyncratic behavior of project staff members became dysfunctional and yet their energy carried the project in many ways. Were the project staff to collaborate with the other entitites in a productive way it was necessary to accommodate to the other human systems. It did so simply by adapting to them but in the absence of the creation of a superordinate system had, for the most part, only temporary impact. The district itself, while its laissez-faire attitude toward the project and the school permitted many activities to go on without interference, was unable to develop an active role as a collaborative entity which recognized that it itself

would have to be changed were the project to have long-term impact. The school faculty was confident that it could maintain itself and endure the project, drawing from it those elements that were pleasing and rejecting those that were not, but without being changed in any lasting way.

Thus all of the entities, while working together vigorously and positively in many ways and generating large numbers of training activities of an extensive sort (see McKibbin, 1979) essentially failed to have a long-term impact on the social systems by failing to develop a clarified relationship which recognized that the normal, professional/social relations among all of the individuals in all of the systems, would have to be changed radically were the project to have a large impact.

[1]Bruce R. Joyce, Greta Morine-Dershimer, and Kathleen M. McNair. Thought and Action in the Classroom: The South Bay Study, Chapters 3, 4, 5 (Palo Alto: Booksend Laboratories, 1978.

[2]Ibid. Chapter 2.

[3]Robert L. Spaulding, "Adapting Teaching Styles to Learning Styles" in Journal of Classroom Interaction 1978, 14 (1) 10-18.

[4]Michael D. McKibbin, "An Analysis of Staff Development and Its Effects on Classroom Practice." Paper presented to 1980 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Mass.

[5]Louis M. Smith and Pat M. Keith. The Anatomy of an Educational Innovation, An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School (New York: Wiley, 1971).

[6]Louis M. Smith. The Complexities of the Urban Classroom (New York: Wiley, 1968).

[7]Michael D. McKibbin and Bruce Joyce, "The Teacher as Learner: Psychological States and Staff Development" in Theory Into Practice (Fall, 1980).